

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative because the amendment of December 15th 2004 raised the issue of a possible election of species requirement, since the scope of the originally presented claims was altered by the amendments to claim 1 and new claim 23 of the December 15th 2004 response. The examiner also noted that applicant's amended claim 1 was missing the clarification that the circuitry components set forth comprised a Magnetic resonance Imaging (MRI) gradient coil system. Applicant's representative agreed to the examiner making an examiner's amendment to Amended independent claims 1, 23 and dependent claims 4-8, in order to clarify that the coil recited was actually a gradient coil consistently, to correct antecedent basis where a correction was needed, to correct grammatical concerns, and remove any "intended use" issue by reciting all structural features with positive recitation. The applicant also agreed to have the examiner amend the specification to include a correction that was missed in the December 15th 2004 response. The examiner informed applicant that new formal drawings are needed due to the fact that the official draftsman has objected to applicant's submitted formal drawings.